

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 7 September 2006 and is supplemental to the Amendment filed 7 December 2006. Independent Claims 1 and 26 have been amended, and then are believed to be distinguishable over the prior art. Dependent Claims 2-11, 13-16 and 22-25 have been amended to be consistent with Claim 1. Claim 14 has additionally been amended to correct a typographical error found therein and Claims 12 and 17-21 have been cancelled from this Application.

It is believed that the further amendment to Claim 1 has not changed the distinctions over the prior art previously argued, however, the prior remarks are supplemented as follows. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Shaver, et al., U.S. Patent 4,964,075.

It is respectfully submitted that the Shaver, et al. reference is directed to a software and hardware independent auxiliary user programmable intelligent keyboard. The device is an add-on accessory that is coupled between a conventional keyboard 11 and a computer system 15. Nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest a user programmable apparatus with a keyboard incorporated therein, as now claimed. The reference clearly teaches away from that structure. The UPKED of the reference does not have keys for normal input, and the nonvolatile memory is programmed by operating keys on another keyboard, for example the regular keyboard. The user programmable entry device 19 includes a

plurality of MACRO keys 25, a Shift key 24 and a programming time delay key 36. A plurality of keys are coupled to a microprocessor 30 through a keyboard decoder 33. The microprocessor 30 is coupled to memory in the form of ROM 31 and RAM 32. The microprocessor 30 is also coupled to communication interfaces 29 and 44. While the keys 25 are programmable with key sequences being stored in memory, nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest any of the keys 25 are programmable to simulate a cursor control device, as now claimed. And while time delays may be inserted between the output of each character code, as the means of slowing the transmission rate of characters, such is neither a different report rate, the rate at which a character code is repeated when a keyboard key is held in an on state, and is clearly not programmable to have a different report rate from that of the other of the plurality of keys to coincide with requirements of a cursor control device, as now claimed. A cursor control device requires a higher report rate than a conventional character key, in order to update the cursor position as the cursor control device is operated. Thus, the reference, rather than increasing a frequency of the trigger signals associated with the switch, as required when simulating a cursor control, the reference teaches away from that structure in providing for increased delays between character codes (assuming that output of character codes stored in memory is equivalent to output of trigger signals from a switch closure, as the Examiner has interpreted the reference).

Shaver et al. does not disclose a nonvolatile memory programmable by operating the plurality of keys on the device itself. Similarly, Shaver et al. does not disclose transmitting normal data corresponding to the trigger signal to outside of the input apparatus, as the UPKED is without keys for normal input. Moreover, in Shaver et al., a computer peripheral is connected with the computer system unit through the UPKED. Shaver et al. only mentions that the MACRO keys can be programmed for a MACRO statement but never discloses or suggests that the MACRO keys are able to simulate a computer peripheral. The computer peripheral is connected with the computer system unit through the UPKED rather than the UPKED being used simulate the computer peripheral.

Therefore, as Shaver, et al. fails to disclose each and every one of the elements of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed, it cannot anticipate that invention. Further, as the reference fails to suggest such a combination of elements, and in fact teaches away from that combination, it cannot make obvious that invention either.

The Kuehneman, et al. reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Shaver, et al. The Kuehneman, et al. reference is directed to a reconfigurable keyboard wherein selected ones of a plurality of key switches are connected to covers for operating those particular key switches, wherein others of the key switches are left inoperable. The device includes a plurality of key tables stored in the device, any one of which may be selected to control the output of the keyboard

and define the functions of each of the operable keys which have been coupled to key covers. Each of the key tables contains a unique set of information to define the nature or function of each of the key locations, and the keyboard can be reconfigured by selecting another key table. To accomplish the configuration functions, the keyboard is required to continuously scan its keys, read the key values, code it properly, and sends out the key codes at an appropriate time. In Kuehneman et al., the providing of a programmable password is performed by a mode subroutine, wherein it is necessary to connect the interface module to the development console for displaying the general rules and instructions, which are stored in the memory of the keyboard, on the development console. Thus, the keyboard of Kuehneman et al. is reconfigured by selecting another key table and the password is programmed by the mode subroutine rather than by programming a nonvolatile memory. Kuehneman et al. does not disclose or suggest a nonvolatile memory programmable by operating the plurality of keys, as claimed. Further, nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest the inclusion of a set of special control keys that are programmable to simulate a cursor control device, the set of special control keys being programmable to have a different report rate from that of the other of the plurality of keys to coincide with requirements of a cursor control device, as now claimed.

Therefore, as neither Shaver, et al., nor Kuehneman, et al. disclose or suggest the concatenation of elements which forms the invention of the subject

Patent Application, their combination cannot make obvious that invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

No fees are believed to be due with this Amendment. If there are any charges associated with this filing, the Honorable Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account #18-2011 for such charges.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/
David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 3 January 2007

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted electronically to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit # 2612, on the date shown below.

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/
DAVID I. KLEIN

01/03/2007
Date